



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,613	12/17/2001	Patrick Baudisch	132954	5897

65575 7590 01/17/2008
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 320850
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850

EXAMINER

RICHER, AARON M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2628

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/17/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/015,613

Applicant(s)

BAUDISCH, PATRICK

Examiner

Aaron M. Richer

Art Unit

2628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed November 2, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. As to claims 1, 11, and 22, applicant argues that one skilled in the art would not have combined the Genetten and Reddy references because they are not technically combinable, and also because the combination would render Genetten unsuitable for its intended purpose. Applicant also argues that the combination does not teach all of the required limitations.
3. Applicant notes that Reddy includes a DAC, while Gennetten does not use an analog display. However, it is not necessary that the references in a 103(a) rejection be physically combinable. Rather the teachings of the references are what is relevant in the rejection. See MPEP 2145, which reads:

"The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference.... Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of those references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 425, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981). See also In re Sneed, 710 F.2d 1544, 1550, 218 USPQ 385, 389 (Fed. Cir. 1983) ("[I]t is not necessary that the inventions of the references be physically combinable to render obvious the invention under review."); and In re Nievelt, 482 F.2d 965, 179 USPQ 224, 226 (CCPA 1973) ("Combining the teachings of references does not involve an ability to combine their specific structures.").

Examiner further notes that while the Reddy invention does include a DAC, it could be modified, in a way obvious to one skilled in the art, to use a second flat-panel controller instead, if the second monitor were an LCD.

4. Applicant further argues that Genetten would be rendered unusable because the combined invention of Genetten and Reddy would not have the

power-conserving advantage of the Genetten reference. Applicant notes that the extra circuitry of the Reddy invention would use more power than the Genetten reference alone. However, one skilled in the art would still recognize the *comparative* advantage of the combined reference over the Reddy reference alone, which is to say that the Reddy reference combined with the Genetten reference would save power over the Reddy reference alone, since the displays in Reddy could be automatically turned off using the teachings of the Genetten reference. In this way, the Genetten reference is being used for its original purpose, to allow an invention to save power.

5. Finally, applicant argues that, because neither Reddy nor Genetten discloses any rescaling, the resolutions of the two displays of Reddy would not match, and therefore the image would not actually be continuous. However, it is noted by examiner that this rescaling step is not actually recited in the claims, and therefore it is irrelevant whether it is disclosed in Reddy or Genetten.

Rather, a determination must be made about whether one skilled in the art would have the skill to combine the Reddy and Genetten references to arrive at the applicant's invention without using impermissible hindsight. Thus, the question becomes: Would one skilled in the art have the knowledge to apply scaling techniques to correctly combine Reddy and Genetten? Given that scaling techniques are broadly known in the art, and even those not skilled in the art are able to scale windows, such as those corresponding to video applications, by dragging their corners to expand or contract size, one would have to assume that one skilled in the art would be able to apply scaling techniques to combine the

Reddy and Genetten references and arrive at the invention recited in claims 1, 11, and 22.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reddy (U.S. Patent 6,215,459) in view of Gennetten (U.S. Patent 6,812,907).

8. As to claims 1, 4, 11, and 22, Reddy discloses a display comprising at least two display devices,

each display device having a display area with a given display resolution wherein the display resolution of at least one display area is different from the display resolution of at least one other display area (col. 8, lines 4-22), and an associated image processor for provided image data (fig. 7, elements 730, 104, 106 and elements 732, 105, 107; while both LCD and CRT are attached to the same overall video controller, the separate DAC and Flatpanel Controller read on separate image processors),

and the displayed resolution of the portion of an image displayed on one of the at least two display areas is different than the displayed resolution of the portion of the image displayed resolution of the portion of the image displayed on at least one other of the two display areas (col. 8, lines 4-22).

Reddy does not disclose a boundary wherein the boundary of each display area is at least partially contiguous with the boundary of at least one other display area, nor does Reddy disclose the display devices being so constructed and arranged such that when an image is displayed across at least two display areas using image information data received from the associate image processors, the resulting displayed image is perceived as substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the image.

Gennetten, however, discloses two separate display devices (col. 9, lines 16-29) that are contiguous (figs. 2, 3, 4, and 5), such that a single image is continuous across the two display areas (col. 2, lines 21-33; large images are displayed across both displays continuously). The motivation for this is to enable detailed view of an image without unnecessarily wasting power (col. 1, line 61- col. 2, line 19). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Reddy to display an image continuously over two devices in order to enable detailed view of that image as taught by Gennetten.

9. As to claims 2, 12, and 23, Reddy discloses a display wherein one display device comprises an LCD display (col. 2, lines 53-56).

10. As to claims 3, 13, and 24, Reddy discloses a display wherein one display device comprises a projector and a projection surface (col. 3, lines 10-30).

11. As to claims 5 and 25, Gennetten discloses a display wherein one display area is adjacent to another display area (figs. 2, 3, 4, and 5).

12. As to claims 6, 14, 26, and 27, Gennetten discloses a display wherein the first display area is surrounded by the second display area (figs. 2 and 3).

13. As to claim 16, Reddy discloses a display wherein there are 2 display areas (fig. 7).

14. Claims, 7-10, 15, and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reddy in view of Gennetten and further in view of Ohzawa (U.S. Patent 6,803,884).

15. As to claim 7, neither Reddy nor Gennetten discloses a third display device having a third display area with third display resolution, wherein the third display resolution is different from at least one of the first display resolution and the second display resolution, and a third boundary. Ohzawa, however, discloses a third display with high resolution compared to the other displays (col. 5, lines 4-20; LCD 11 is the center LCD in fig. 1). The advantage of the high resolution display is that it can be used to create a sharp projection image (col. 5, lines 4-20). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Reddy and Gennetten to use a third display with higher resolution than the other two in order to create a sharp projection image as taught by Ohzawa.

16. As to claims 8, 10, 15, and 19, Ohzawa discloses a three display system wherein two displays surround a first display, as described in the rejection to claim 7. Gennetten further discloses a display wherein the first display area fully surrounds the second display area as described in the rejection to claim 6. The teachings of Gennetten can be equivalently applied to a three display system, creating a three display system in which two displays are surrounded by another display, and in which a display is surrounded by a display which is surrounded by

another display. Motivation for this combination is found in the rejection to claim 1 and the rejection to claim 7.

17. As to claims 9, 20, and 21, Ohzawa discloses a display wherein in the second and third display areas are spaced apart with a portion of the first display area interposed there between (fig. 2; note that part of image m1 is between the other images, while part is above or below the space between the other images).

18. As to claims 17 and 18, Ohzawa discloses 3 display areas (fig. 1) and 5 display areas (fig. 7). See the rejection to claim 7 for motivation to add a third or fifth high-resolution display to combination of Reddy and Gennetten.

Conclusion

19. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron M. Richer whose telephone number is

(571) 272-7790. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kee Tung can be reached on (571) 272-7794. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AMR
1/15/08



KEE M. TUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER